

Summary of IDEM Steering Group Meeting WATER QUALITY RULES, TRIENNIAL REVIEW AND RELATED TOPICS

Introduction:

On Tuesday, December 10, 2002, IDEM staff met for the fourth time with a wide cross-section of stakeholders which make up the steering committee to IDEM for the triennial review of the state's water quality standards and related issues. These notes are intended to be a summary of the major points from the meeting held at IDEM's Shadeland offices.

The meeting was called to order by Mary Ellen Gray. From the sign-in sheet, those in attendance for all or part of the meeting included: Art Umble, Bill Beranek, Bowden Quinn, Chad Frahm, Eric Fry, Diana Toth, John Chavez, Neil Parke, Patrick Bennett, Robin Feller, Ron Turco, Tim Lohner and Tom Simon.

In addition, the following IDEM staff members were present for all or part of the meeting: David Kallander, Dennis Clark, John Elliott, John Nixon, Kiran Verma, Larry Wu, Lonnie Brumfield, MaryAnn Stevens, Megan Wallace, Steve Roush and Tonya Galbraith.

Summary:

The meeting began by asking the workgroup members if they had any additions to the agenda (there were none) or any changes to the 10/3/02 minutes (there were none). Minutes from the steering committee and workgroup meetings will be posted to the IDEM Web site after approval.

1. Reports.
 - A. Mercury. The 10/9/02 minutes were summarized. It was mentioned that Bill Beranek had prepared a thought piece that has been circulated. The next meeting will be 12/10/02.
 - B. Antidegradation/OSRW. The 11/6/02 and 11/22/02 minutes were summarized. Workgroup members are to review the WQAG Final Report. At the next meeting, 12/19/02, the workgroup will begin to engage the issues.
 - C. *E. coli*. The 11/18/02 meeting focused on the process of getting to the issues. Information has been gathered for Kansas, Michigan, Ohio and Texas. Collected information will be distributed on CD-ROM and posted to the Web site.
 - D. Fast Track. The first meeting, 12/10/02, will focus on the details of the workplan with issues being addressed at the second meeting.
2. Suggestions for Public Participation.
 - A. How can the process be made as inclusive as possible? It was suggested that: the group look into what keeps people from attending (e.g., travel,

time, knowledge); public participation should be early in the process; and, videoconferencing (e.g., IHAT) should be considered. Concern was raised with problems caused by large numbers of folks involved in the process (e.g., the need to bring people up to speed, the general loss of efficiency of a larger group). Education was held out as the way to keep folks current (e.g., minutes on the Web site, presentations to the public, allowing folks to provide comments through the Web site). One member stressed the difference between public participation and public information. Limiting participation did not prevent getting information out to the public.

- B. When should the workgroups present their progress with the public? The workgroups should keep to their established timetables and meet with the public when they have developed something tangible. After some discussion it was suggested that when IDEM, based on workgroup recommendations, prepares draft language that that would be a good point to have public participation.
 - C. What is the role of the workgroup in public participation? The workgroups need to be kept small and filled with dedicated people. It should be the responsibility of the workgroup members, representing interest groups, to get the word out. The workgroups should strive to make the work understandable to the public. It was not agreed whether the workgroup or the steering committee was better positioned to deal with a public forum.
 - D. How will the Water Pollution Control Board be updated? Rules should be brought before the Board prior to preliminary adoption. Perhaps, as with GLI, the Board can hold evening meetings around the state. The Board would be helped by being provided with a discussion of the policy issues at stake. Workgroups should separate technical and policy issues. The Board needs to be provided additional information on fiscal impacts. When these impacts are discussed, information (i.e., data, studies) should be provided to back up the assertion. Perhaps economic information could be presented to the Board at the same time as the draft language.
 - E. Other public participation ideas. Utilizing lists of neighborhood organizations, not for profits, etc., specific interest groups could be alerted of upcoming meetings and asked if they would like a presentation to be made at one of their meetings. Instead of the typical 30 day comment period, a 60 day period would provide folks with more time to think about the issues.
3. The Public Participation ideas were summarized.
- A. Will look into videoconferencing, replies via the Web site, listserv.
 - B. When to get the word out:
 - 1) when the workgroups reach an end point (e.g., draft language), hold a public meeting.
 - 2) get lists of folks and let them know when meetings are being held.
 - C. Updates to the WPCB:
 - 1) periodic.

- 2) Focus on educating on policy issues.
 - 3) Include economic impact of policy.
4. The next meeting will be Wednesday, March 19, 2003, from 10:00am to Noon, at the Indiana Department of Environmental Management, 2525 North Shadeland Avenue, Conference Room C, Indianapolis, Indiana. Will have a follow up on Public Participation. The alternate date for the meeting is March 26, 2003.